United Nations A/60/PV.61

General Assembly

Sixtieth session

Official Records

61st plenary meeting
Thursday, 8 December 2005, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Eliasson ..... (Sweden)

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Reports of the Sixth Committee

The President: The General Assembly will consider today the reports of the Sixth Committee on agenda items 83, 108 and 116.

I request the Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee, Ms. Shermain Jeremy of Antigua and Barbuda, to introduce in one intervention the reports of the Sixth Committee before the General Assembly.

Ms. Jeremy (Antigua and Barbuda), Rapporteur of the Sixth Committee: At the 53rd meeting, held on 23 November, I indicated that the reports of the Sixth Committee on agenda item 83, "Scope of legal protection under the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel", agenda item 108, "Measures to eliminate international terrorism", and the procedural agenda item 116, "Revitalization of the Work of the General Assembly", would be considered by the Assembly at a later date. It is now a great honour and privilege for me to introduce the reports of the Sixth Committee on those three items remaining on its agenda.

First, I would like to draw the Assembly's attention to item 83, "Scope of legal protection under the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel". The relevant report of the Sixth Committee is contained in document A/60/518, and the draft resolution recommended to the Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 12 of that document. It will be recalled that in paragraph 167 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), heads of State and Government stressed the need to conclude negotiations on an optional protocol during the current session. I am therefore happy to state that the draft resolution contains in its annex the text of the draft Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

Under the terms of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would, inter alia, reaffirm, in the context of the Convention and its draft Optional Protocol, the importance of maintaining the integrity of international humanitarian law, and would also encourage States to enact national legislation, as necessary, in order to enable the implementation of the Convention and the draft Optional Protocol. Such legislation would be necessary, particularly in the context of the term "peacebuilding" in paragraph 1 (a) of article II of the Optional Protocol.

By the operative paragraphs of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would adopt the draft Optional Protocol and request the Secretary-General, as depositary, to open it for signature. In accordance with its article IV, the Protocol shall be open for signature by all States at United Nations Headquarters from 16 January 2006 to 16 January 2007. The Assembly would also invite States to become parties to the Protocol.

The draft resolution was adopted by the Sixth Committee without a vote. It is my hope that the Assembly will be in a position to do the same.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

05-63248 (E)

I now draw the attention of the Assembly to agenda item 108, "Measures to eliminate international terrorism". The relevant report of the Sixth Committee is contained in document A/60/519, and the draft resolution recommended to the General Assembly for adoption is reproduced in paragraph 10 of that report. By the terms of the draft resolution, the Assembly would, inter alia, strongly condemn all acts, methods and practices of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations as criminal and unjustifiable, wherever and by whomsoever committed and remind States of their obligations under relevant international conventions and protocols and Security Council resolutions to ensure that perpetrators of terrorist acts are brought to justice.

The Assembly would welcome the recent adoption and opening for signature of a number of anti-terrorism instruments, including the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, and would urge States that have not yet done so to consider, as a matter of priority, and in accordance with Security Council resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1566 (2004), becoming parties to the relevant conventions and protocols. Furthermore, the Assembly would note the progress attained in the elaboration of the draft comprehensive convention on international terrorism and welcome continuing efforts to that end, and it would decide that the Ad Hoc Committee established pursuant to resolution 51/210 of 17 December 1996 shall, on an expedited basis, continue to elaborate the draft comprehensive convention and shall continue to discuss the item concerning the question of convening a high-level conference under the auspices of the United Nations, which was also included on its agenda pursuant to the Assembly's resolution 54/110.

The Assembly would decide that the Ad Hoc Committee shall meet from 27 February to 3 March 2006 in order to fulfil its mandate. The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. It is hoped that the Assembly will do the same.

Finally, I draw the attention of the Assembly to agenda item 116, entitled "Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly". The report of the Sixth Committee on this item is contained in document A/60/523, and the draft decision recommended for adoption by the General Assembly is reproduced in paragraph 5 of the report.

By terms of the draft decision, the General Assembly would take note that the Sixth Committee adopted the provisional programme of work for the sixty-first session of the General Assembly as proposed by its Bureau. In accordance with the provisional programme, the Sixth Committee would commence its work on 10 October and would close its next session on 9 November 2006.

This concludes my presentation of the remaining reports of the Sixth Committee. I would like to take this opportunity to thank once again the Chairman of the Sixth Committee and the other members of the Bureau for their assistance and wise counsel, as well as all representatives and colleagues for their hard work throughout the session.

The President: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the Sixth Committee which are before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote or position.

The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Sixth Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records. May I remind members that under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, i.e., either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee".

May I remind delegations that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the Sixth Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Sixth Committee unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise in advance. I should therefore hope that we may proceed to adopt without a

vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the Sixth Committee.

Agenda item 83

Scope of legal protection under the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/60/518)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 12 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution, entitled "Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel".

The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 60/42).

The President: I shall now give the floor to those representatives wishing to make statements in explanation of position on the resolution just adopted.

Mr. Thomson (United Kingdom): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the 25 countries of the European Union. A further 12 countries align themselves with this statement: Bulgaria, Romania, Croatia, Turkey, Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Serbia and Montenegro, Iceland, Norway, Ukraine and Moldova.

In the light of explanations of position by other delegations during the adoption of the Protocol on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel in the Sixth Committee, the European Union wishes to make clear its position on the following issues.

First, the European Union does not agree that the term "peacebuilding" in the third preambular paragraph and in paragraph 1(a) of article II of the Protocol is restricted to conflict or post-conflict situations. In our view, United Nations operations at any stage of the conflict cycle may be peacebuilding operations under the Protocol. We note that the statement by the President of the Security Council of 20 February 2002 (S/PRST/2001/5) took the same non-restrictive approach.

Secondly, the Protocol extends the application of the 1994 Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel to all such United Nations operations, without reference to any trigger mechanism of risk or exceptional risk. Indeed, the central purpose of the Protocol is to eliminate the need for any such trigger, as was contained in the 1994 Convention. That has been achieved by extending the scope of application to all peacebuilding operations and operations for the delivery of emergency humanitarian assistance.

Thirdly, we are pleased that the Protocol applies equally to operations delivering emergency humanitarian assistance in natural-disaster situations. United Nations and associated personnel require the protection of the Convention and the Protocol in such situations. We regret the fact that some delegations felt the need for an opt-out declaration.

Concluding the Protocol is a very important step forward in the protection of United Nations and associated personnel. The annual reports of the Secretary-General which list the deaths, injuries and harassment of United Nations and associated personnel in the field make alarming reading. The European Union wishes to take this opportunity to pay tribute once again to the courageous work of these personnel on behalf of the international community.

We emphasize the need for universal accession to the 1994 Convention and encourage States to consider rapidly becoming parties to this Protocol. The European Union would like to thank again Ambassador Wenaweser of Liechtenstein for his skilful and tireless efforts in bringing this Protocol to a conclusion. We would like to thank the delegation of New Zealand for this initiative, and in particular Ms. Jennifer McIver for her invaluable contribution to the negotiations. We would like to thank all other delegations for the flexibility and determination which they showed to achieve this result.

Mr. Oshima (Japan): Japan welcomes the adoption of the Protocol to the 1994 Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel as representing the first concrete achievement so far in the implementation of the 2005 World Summit Outcome. The Protocol, in expanding the scope of legal protection of United Nations and associated personnel

participating in United Nations activities, also represents a remarkable step forward in promoting the safety of those people on the ground who dedicate themselves, sometimes at the risk of their own lives, to carrying out humanitarian, political and development assistance in peacebuilding and to promoting emergency humanitarian assistance. Further, the adoption of the Protocol demonstrates the will of the international community to work together to provide an environment that will support and promote those valuable activities.

We also believe that through the process of adopting the Protocol, interest in and understanding of the 1994 Convention among States has increased significantly, which should also be regarded as another important development.

I wish to take this opportunity to express Japan's high appreciation to Ambassador Christian Wenaweser of Liechtenstein for the great efforts and initiatives he has taken as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee and the Working Group to bring the negotiations on the Protocol to fruition. Our appreciation also goes to Ms. Jennifer McIver from the Mission of New Zealand for her important contribution. Furthermore, the adoption of the Protocol would not have been possible without the cooperation among all Member States that recognized the necessity and urgency of expanding the legal protection of United Nations and associated personnel. It was a source of great satisfaction for us to actively participate in the discussions and to contribute to the negotiating process with other Member States to make possible the adoption of the Protocol through consensus.

The challenges that United Nations activities face and that the 1994 Convention and 2005 Protocol directly address are indeed daunting and have become more so in recent years. Conflicts and natural and man-made disasters abound and seem to be constantly on the rise, thus resulting in an ever increasing number of United Nations emergency humanitarian, peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations. Personnel who are deployed to perform their valuable work on the ground are exposed to risks that seem to become both more complex and more frequent. We are particularly disturbed by continuing attacks directed against United Nations and associated personnel engaged in those missions, despite measures taken by the international community to ensure their safety. Those attacks and similar acts must be strongly condemned.

Japan highly appreciates the contributions that United Nations personnel are making in various capacities, including humanitarian and peacekeeping operations, to save people's lives and alleviate their suffering and to help to maintain international peace and security. Japan has made its own contributions to assist those efforts, both financially and by deploying its own personnel, and it is our intention to continue such efforts in support of the United Nations and in concert with other countries.

Currently, 79 States are parties to the 1994 Convention, and yet many of the host States involved in a variety of United Nations missions and activities are not parties to the Convention. We therefore call for greater participation of States in the Convention and for expanding the scope of the Convention through the Protocol in order to enhance its effectiveness.

We would like to draw attention once again to one of the important purposes of the Protocol, and that is to enable more States to adhere to the Convention and its Protocol. We are of the view that clarity on the Convention's scope of application is essential so that the Protocol can be applied in domestic courts and can be ratified by as many States as possible. That will also be helpful both to host States and posted United Nations and associated personnel. In that regard, Japan believes that the term "peacebuilding", as used in the Protocol, will need to be further clarified through the practice of ongoing and future activities, together with what experience can teach us.

Japan wishes to underscore once again the significance of the adoption of the Protocol in strengthening and expanding the legal protection afforded to United Nations and associated personnel. We continue to call on States which have not yet done so to become parties to the Convention, as recommended by our leaders in the World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1).

We strongly hope that United Nations and associated personnel will be better protected from dangers and risks — as they deserve to be protected in the conduct of their missions — by the 1994 Convention and its Protocol. The international community owes it to itself to continue its utmost efforts to promote their safety, wherever and whenever they are deployed to carry out their noble tasks.

Mr. Playle (Australia): After four years of negotiations, Australia welcomes the adoption of the

Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel. It is a significant achievement and meets our leaders' expectation that we conclude the Protocol during the current session. We thank Ambassador Christian Wenaweser for his incisive and tireless efforts as Chair of the ad hoc committee and working group that negotiated the Protocol. We also thank New Zealand for coordinating the resolution before us, particularly our friend Jennifer McIver for her leading role in the negotiations.

We are pleased the Protocol does away with the requirement in the Convention that the General Assembly or the Security Council must make a declaration of exceptional risk before the Convention can apply to anything other than a United Nations peacekeeping operation. Such a declaration has never been made. Relying on States to assess whether an operation entails risk has manifestly failed to protect personnel deployed on the full range of United Nations operations. We consider that the Protocol adopts the right approach by instead extending the automatic application of the Convention to two new categories of United Nations operations.

First, States parties to the Protocol will be obliged to apply the Convention automatically to United Nations operations "delivering humanitarian, political or development assistance in peacebuilding". Australia is pleased States were able to agree on this provision as a compromise solution, the scope of which hinges on how the term "peacebuilding" is interpreted. Australia believes peacebuilding must be interpreted broadly to encompass the whole conflict cycle, such that the Protocol would cover pre-conflict, conflict and post-conflict operations. We appeal to all States to adopt a similarly broad interpretation.

I note that Australia's broad interpretation of peacebuilding is based on sound precedent that we would commend to all States. Within our own Government, the Australian Defence Force defines peacebuilding as "a set of strategies which aim to ensure that disputes, armed conflicts and other major crises do not arise in the first place or, if they do arise, that they do not subsequently recur". And within the United Nations, the statement by the President of the Security Council on 20 February 2001 recognized that "peacebuilding is aimed at preventing the outbreak, the recurrence or continuation of armed conflict" (*S/PRST/2001/5*).

Secondly, States parties to the Protocol will be obliged to apply the Convention automatically to United Nations operations delivering emergency humanitarian assistance. Australia is also pleased that States were able to agree on that provision, the application of which, we note, in no way depends on how the term "peacebuilding" is interpreted.

The Protocol allows States parties to opt out from applying the provisions of the Convention to a United Nations operation delivering emergency humanitarian assistance when that operation is conducted for the sole purpose of responding to a natural disaster. Australia reluctantly accepted that provision, but we hope it will never be used. History has shown that natural disasters can often lead to a breakdown in law and order. United Nations and associated personnel deployed in such circumstances should unquestionably enjoy the protections of the Convention.

Australia would have preferred that the Protocol extend the automatic application of the Convention to all United Nations and associated personnel deployed on all United Nations operations. We have made substantial concessions during negotiations on the Protocol before us. Whatever we might regard as its shortcomings, the Protocol has the capacity to provide protection to substantially larger numbers of United Nations and associated personnel than have thus far been covered by the Convention. But this depends on States, including those hosting United Nations operations, becoming Parties to both the Convention and the Protocol.

Above all, we appeal to all States to do just that. The ultimate value of the Protocol we have just adopted, and indeed of the Convention on which it builds, depends on universal adherence to them both.

Ms. Banks (New Zealand): Four years ago, during the fifty-sixth session of the General Assembly, New Zealand led a group of States that sought inclusion of item 83 on the agenda of the Sixth Committee. Since that time, the working group of the Sixth Committee has worked hard to develop a new text to supplement the Convention. Earlier in the session, in the outcome document of the world summit, our leaders stressed the need to complete that work this session. We are very pleased that, in fulfilment of the call issued during the summit, the Assembly today has been able to adopt the new Optional Protocol to the

1994 Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel by consensus.

Throughout the negotiating process, New Zealand has worked closely with those others most interested in the final text of the Optional Protocol. New Zealand is well aware of the substantial flexibility that was required of all of us to achieve the successful outcome we have before us today. New Zealand considers that the unity achieved on the text of the Optional Protocol can be attributed to Member States' shared commitment to acting in the face of rising statistics of attacks against United Nations and associated personnel. In 2004, there were 120 cases of assault recorded against United Nations personnel. In 2005, that number has reached 407. One factor assisting negotiations on the Optional Protocol was Member States' unanimous agreement on the need to avoid the trigger mechanism of a declaration of exceptional risk. Instead, the Committee aimed to expand legal protection for United Nations and associated personnel through a new instrument that could be applied automatically.

Although New Zealand, among others, would have preferred to extend the protections of the Convention to all United Nations and associated personnel, it was agreed that the Protocol would apply the Convention automatically to two new categories of United Nations operations: peacebuilding operations and emergency humanitarian assistance operations.

New Zealand understands peacebuilding to encompass all political developments and humanitarian activities aimed at preventing the outbreak, continuation or recurrence of conflict. New Zealand will continue to work within the United Nations on a collective, broad understanding of peacebuilding that recognizes the need for early identification of situations where peacebuilding is required and includes the consent and cooperation of the Government concerned, where one exists. This approach to the issue of peacebuilding is consistent with the statement of the President of the Security Council of 20 February 2001.

Humanitarian assistance operations respond to human need in life-threatening situations. The risk arising in circumstances that lead to humanitarian emergencies is self-evident and clearly demonstrated by recent experience. While New Zealand is ready to recognize the theoretical potential that a natural disaster may occur in the most stable of environments, where no particular risk is faced by United Nations and associated personnel engaged in the humanitarian response, New Zealand considers that, in real terms, scenarios where the legal protections offered by the Convention and the Protocol are unwarranted will be exceptional.

New Zealand wishes to thank the chair of the working group, Ambassador Christian Wenaweser of Liechtenstein, for his leadership and enduring commitment to the goal of a new Protocol that more adequately reflects the range of operations conducted under United Nations authority today. We consider that the long-awaited adoption of the Optional Protocol to the 1994 Convention is a significant achievement, the importance of which was recognized by our world leaders in the summit outcome document. We hope that the adoption by consensus of this new legal instrument will open the door for many more States to ratify the Convention and, at the same time, the Optional Protocol.

Mr. Laurin (Canada): I take it from Special Canada is delighted to note that this important Protocol has been successfully concluded after several years of hard work. Within the framework of this initiative, States have shown their desire to do something about the impunity enjoyed by those who perpetrate offenses against humanitarian aid workers. A commitment has been expressed, in a legal document, and we must ensure that it will be followed by concrete actions.

In this context, Canada would like to recognize in particular the crucial role played by Ambassador Christian Wenaweser in guiding our deliberations, which enabled us to reach agreement. We would also like to thank our colleagues from New Zealand, Jennifer McIntyre, for her efforts during consideration of the resolution, which once again, made it possible to ensure unanimous adoption.

I would note that the Protocol represents a painstaking balance of interests and we welcome its adoption as a favourable event that will help to ensure the safety of the United Nations and associated personnel. Having said this, we do regret that it was necessary, in order to obtain consensus, to include an abstention option in the Protocol in situations of natural disaster. In light, more specifically, of events last year, it is regrettable that some States found it necessary to have recourse to an opt-out clause.

(spoke in English)

As the Secretary-General has observed previously, the difficulty in the issuance of a declaration of exceptional risk has been the single most important limitation to the protective regime of the Convention. One of the key accomplishments of the Protocol is thus the elimination of the exceptional risk trigger contained in the 1994 Convention by extending the scope of the application of the Convention to all peacebuilding operations and operations for the delivery of emergency humanitarian assistance.

As the recent attacks on humanitarian aid workers in Southern Sudan and Northern Uganda illustrate, the provision of humanitarian relief often puts the safety of humanitarian aid workers at risk. It is therefore incumbent on States to continue to take concrete steps to enhance the safety and security of those workers and to hold accountable those who perpetrate attacks against them. We agree with the European Union that the term "peacebuilding" in preambular paragraph three and article II 1(a) of the Protocol is not restricted to conflict or post-conflict situations. A United Nations operation may be a peacebuilding operation under the Protocol not only at the conflict and post-conflict stage, but at the pre-conflict stage as well.

While Canada had initially suggested that a definition of the concept of peacebuilding in the Optional Protocol would be desirable, we have moved away from that position in the spirit of achieving the widest possible acceptance of the draft instrument. We also acknowledge that States' understanding of peacebuilding is still evolving in connection with other discussions in this forum and we appreciate the flexibility provided by the present text to accommodate a wider understanding and set of protections than we might otherwise have been able to achieve.

Mr. Sandoval Bernal (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): With regard to the adoption of the draft resolution on the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel, the delegation of Colombia wishes to express its gratitude to the chairman of the negotiating committee, the representative of Liechtenstein, Ambassador Christian Wenaweser, for the excellent work he has done and the balance and thought with which he guided the work that led to the adoption of this instrument by consensus.

The Optional Protocol just adopted represents substantial progress towards strengthening the legal protection of United Nations and associated personnel participating in the operations carried out by the Organization. The Convention marked a milestone in that area, even though a complementary, binding instrument was needed to broaden the scope of that protection.

While my delegation joined the consensus on the final text of the Optional Protocol, it would have preferred that the term "peacebuilding" — which is used in the Optional Protocol's third preambular paragraph and its article II to designate one of the forms of United Nations operations — had been properly defined. As would be the case with any binding instrument, it does not seem advisable, from the point of view of judicial precision and the practical consequences of the Protocol's implementation, that a term employed to define the Protocol's scope of application or part thereof should remain undefined, because that lack of definition can lead not only to a broad range of conflicting interpretations but also to the erroneous, if not arbitrary, application of the Convention.

The term "peacebuilding" is an innovation in public international law and, as such, has not been defined. For that reason, it would have been appropriate to include in the Optional Protocol a clause defining the term "peacebuilding" in order to guide the Protocol's application. Our numerous statements on this subject in the course of the negotiations aimed to achieve legal precision and delimitation of that term.

In the absence of such a definition, my delegation interprets that innovative concept, first, in the light of the common understanding of the Spanish word "*consolidar*", from which one can infer that such peacebuilding is carried out only when, after peace has been broken by a conflict, that conflict comes to end. That leads to the gradual re-establishment of the state of peace, which continues until that peace is consolidated.

Thus, legal logic and precision are challenged by assuming that one could propose peacebuilding operations for situations that are not contemplated or even defined by international law, such as pre-conflict situations, destabilizing social unrest and the breakdown of society. Nor would it be appropriate to propose such operations for conflict situations, because

what does not exist — peace, in this case — cannot be consolidated.

Thus, we interpret the term "peacebuilding" in conformity with its use in paragraph 97 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (*resolution 60/1*), which limits such operations to post-conflict situations and which emphasizes the need for a coordinated, coherent and integrated approach to post-conflict peacebuilding with a view to achieving sustainable peace, making use of a dedicated institutional mechanism to address the needs of countries emerging from conflict towards recovery, reintegration and reconstruction and to assist them in laying the foundation for sustainable development.

My delegation will reaffirm those interpretative criteria in the deliberations to be held to establish the Peacebuilding Commission.

Colombia reaffirms its commitment to strengthening the legal protection of United Nations and associated personnel, as demonstrated by the consultation process and the domestic steps we have taken in order to join the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel and by our constant presence and flexibility in the work that led to the adoption of the Optional Protocol.

Mr. Lauber (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): Switzerland welcomes the conclusion of negotiations on expanding the scope of legal protection under the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel. The agreed solutions constitute real overall progress compared to the 1994 Convention.

We take this occasion to warmly thank the Chairman of the Working Group, Ambassador Christian Wenaweser of Liechtenstein, for his excellent conduct of the sometimes difficult negotiations. We also thank the delegation of New Zealand, in particular Ms. Jennifer McIver, for their crucial contribution, which led to the conclusion of those negotiations.

With respect to the explanations of vote made by several delegations during the draft resolution's adoption in the Sixth Commission, Switzerland wishes to underline the following points.

First, Switzerland favours a broad interpretation of the concept of peacebuilding in order to ensure the greatest possible protection of personnel deployed on the ground, and we call on future States parties to the Protocol to adopt the same broad interpretation. Nothing in the Protocol suggests that its application concerning the delivery of humanitarian, political or development assistance in peacebuilding should be limited to the post-conflict phases of a recurring conflict.

Secondly, one of the greatest improvements introduced by the Protocol is the suppression of the mechanism requiring a declaration of risk for the application of the Convention. We therefore stress that the States parties should automatically apply the Protocol to the two categories of United Nations operations within the scope of this instrument, in other words, not only for the delivery of humanitarian, political or development assistance in peacebuilding but also in delivering emergency humanitarian assistance.

Finally, in the light of the improvements introduced by the Protocol to the 1994 Convention, Switzerland has undertaken the domestic procedures for joining the Convention and ratifying the Protocol and calls on States that have not yet done so to do likewise.

In conclusion, the Swiss delegation also hopes that the important question of the relation between the Convention's regime and international humanitarian law is not neglected but can be duly studied in order to find an appropriate solution.

Mr. Gandhi (India): We would like to congratulate the Sixth Committee for its efforts to expand the scope of legal protection under the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel, which culminated in the Optional Protocol contained in the annex to the draft resolution contained in A/60/518.

The safety and security of United Nations and associated personnel is one of India's priorities, as India is a major troop-contributing country. At the same time, we believe that a legal instrument in that regard must contain precise and definite language. Regrettably, it has not been possible to couch the Optional Protocol in precise and definite language, given the need to achieve broad consensus on the Protocol. Nevertheless, given the importance of the Protocol's subject matter, we join the consensus on the adoption of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel with the following understanding.

First, article I of the Protocol is applicable only to operations that entail particular risk for United Nations and associated personnel, as stipulated in the third preambular paragraph of the Protocol.

Secondly, the term "peacebuilding", wherever it occurs in the Protocol, is understood to refer only to post-conflict peacebuilding, that is, as the term "peacebuilding" has been traditionally understood in contemporary United Nations documents.

Mr. Tugio (Indonesia): My delegation attaches great importance to the issue of the safety and security of United Nations personnel deployed in conflict zones to work towards, and in the interests of, peace. That continues to be an issue of high priority, because the safety of United Nations personnel is the primary factor in the success of the Organization's political and humanitarian operations.

Regrettably, the statistics regarding United Nations personnel killed in the line of duty have not declined appreciably. It is imperative that we expand the scope of protections available to them, in order to prevent further casualties and promote the effectiveness of United Nations personnel in the field.

Although Indonesia is not among the top 10 troop-contributing countries to United Nations peacebuilding operations, we attach great importance to participation in the Organization's activities designed to restore peace to conflict areas. That has become our national commitment, and we have continued to improve our rapid deployment capacity in readiness for United Nations blue-helmet activities and to make troops available for deployment.

On the basis of that experience, we understand the importance of an appropriate legal framework aimed at enhancing the protection of United Nations and associated personnel. Indonesia strongly condemns all acts of violence against United Nations and associated personnel. We believe that every life lost, every injury caused to, and every detention of and assault against humanitarian personnel is a violation of national and international humanitarian law, and must be treated as such.

On the other side of the coin, such protections also entail obligations on all humanitarian personnel to respect the national laws of the countries in which they are deployed. In that regard, it is important that we uphold the jurisdiction of host States to bring justice in all cases of violations by United Nations and associated personnel.

During the negotiations on the Optional Protocol in the Sixth Committee, divergent views emerged concerning the Protocol's scope of application. My delegation would like to commend all members for their flexibility, which led to consensus on the approach to the concept of peacebuilding operations. We believe that it is wise to leave it to national legislation to determine the Protocol's application in order to be consistent with the objective of strengthening the safety and security of United Nations and associated personnel. In the light of that, my delegation wishes to state its interpretation of the Optional Protocol, namely, that its scope of application shall not be extended to pre-conflict situations. That is consistent with the current stage of the evolution of the Peacebuilding Commission, which deals only with post-conflict situations.

Mrs. Ramos Rodríguez (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): Along with other delegations, the delegation of Cuba is pleased that we were able to reach a compromise formula to allow for the consensus adoption of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel. That consensus was possible due to the inclusion of the term "peacebuilding", despite the fact that we all know that we do not have a broadly accepted definition of that term, either in political doctrine or under international law. It is therefore now up to States to enact the national legislation necessary to implement the Convention and the Optional Protocol.

In that regard, my delegation would like to state that Cuba believes that the term "peacebuilding" is not applicable to pre-conflict situations or to the provisions regarding emergency humanitarian assistance under article II (1) (b) of the Optional Protocol in instances when such operations are undertaken with the sole purpose of responding to a natural disaster. We believe that there is no exceptional risk in such situations for United Nations and associated personnel that would call for protection beyond what they would already enjoy under the national legislation of host countries and their agreements with the United Nations for the deployment of such operations.

Mr. Shin Kak-soo (Republic of Korea): The Republic of Korea welcomes the adoption of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of

United Nations and Associated Personnel. As mentioned in the President's letter, that is the first accomplishment of our responsibility as mandated by our leaders at the world summit last September.

Like previous speakers, we also commend the contributions of Ambassador Christian Wenaweser of Liechtenstein, acting as Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Scope of Legal Protection under the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel, and of Jennifer McIver of New Zealand, acting as coordinator, in completing these difficult tasks.

We attach great importance to the value of the Optional Protocol in enhancing and expanding protection for United Nations and associated personnel, whose safety is threatened daily by a variety of dangers. The Protocol lifts the cumbersome and impractical trigger mechanism under the 1994 Convention and thus strengthens and enhances the safety and protection of United Nations personnel engaging in inherently risky work, such as delivering humanitarian, political or development assistance in peacebuilding situations or providing emergency humanitarian assistance.

When States enact domestic legislation to implement the Protocol, the paramount concern should be to ensure the fullest possible protection for United Nations and associated personnel throughout the continuum of conflicts, including in pre-conflict situations. In that regard, it should be our common purpose to safeguard the integrity of the Protocol.

Our efforts to attain the universality of the 1994 Convention should continue. The goal for the new Protocol should likewise be universal ratification.

Ms. Taj El Dine (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): In joining the consensus on the resolution, my delegation did so with a view to extending adequate protection to United Nations personnel operating in the field under exceptional risk. We would, however, like to focus our intervention on our interpretation of three elements of the resolution, whose annex contains the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

First, we understand that both the Convention and the Protocol will not apply in situations governed by international humanitarian law.

Secondly, we believe that the term "peacebuilding operations" does not contain legally defined concepts or provisions. We would therefore like to avoid conceptual ambiguity in the Protocol. My delegation believes that peacebuilding operations seem to constitute a new intervention mechanism for States. Moreover, certain States are attempting to confuse matters even further by stating that peacebuilding operations enjoy a greater margin for action — such as in conflict and pre-conflict situations. My delegation therefore disassociates itself from the concept of "peacebuilding", which is found in the third preambular paragraph of the resolution and in article II, paragraph 1 (a) of the Optional Protocol. In that connection, we understand that article II would be applicable solely to post-conflict situations in which there is exceptional risk. There can be no doubt about that.

Thirdly, with regard to natural-disaster situations, we understand that the Protocol will be applicable only in instances where there is exceptional risk. In addition, we understand the reference in the Protocol to "host State" to implicitly mean a host State that is party to both the Protocol and the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

In conclusion, we would like to thank Ambassador Christian Wenaweser for his efforts in finalizing the Protocol, as well as Ms. Jennifer McIver for all her efforts and for coordinating our work.

Mr. Hmoud (Jordan): Jordan welcomes the adoption of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel. The Protocol strengthens the protection regime for personnel in the field who are subjected to various risks. We also commend Ambassador Christian Wenaweser of Liechtenstein, Chairman of the Working Group of the Sixth Committee on the Scope of Legal Protection under the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel, for his outstanding efforts, which ensured the conclusion of the Protocol. We also thank Ms. Jennifer McIver of New Zealand for her role in facilitating consensus on the Protocol.

In the light of other delegations' explanations of position, my delegation would like to make the following comments.

First, in relation to peacebuilding, Jordan understands the scope of the Protocol to include

operations beyond conflict and post-conflict situations. Peacebuilding operations aim to create peace. That defines its scope. The relevant paragraph of the World Summit Outcome (*resolution 60/1*) deals only with a part of the scope of peacebuilding. Again, it does not exclude other parts. Nothing in the Protocol indicates that the term is limited only to post-conflict situations.

The term peacebuilding is a developing term under international law. Its specific definition is to be determined according to future international practice by States, international organizations and other subjects of international law. Furthermore, agreements between the United Nations and host countries under host country agreements, status-of-forces agreements and status-of-mission agreements are considered substantial evidentiary elements on the nature of the peacebuilding operation to be established.

Secondly, Jordan understands article III of the Optional Protocol to assert the right of a State party to exercise its national jurisdiction — including over criminal matters — over United Nations and associated personnel who violate the laws of a State party. According to that article, such exercise is limited by other obligations of that State under international law, including, inter alia, the relevant international conventions and treaties applicable to that State.

Mr. Dolatyar (Islamic Republic of Iran): My delegation welcomes the adoption of the resolution just adopted, as well as the Optional Protocol annexed thereto. We would like to thank and commend the Chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Scope of Legal Protection under the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel, as well as all delegations that participated in and contributed to the development and finalization of the Protocol. As the President rightly highlighted in his letter, this is the first achievement and accomplishment of our responsibilities mandated by our leaders at the world summit in September 2005.

My delegation joined the consensus to adopt the Protocol on the basis of the following understandings.

First, the element of particular risks referred to in the third preambular paragraph of the Protocol is an important one that needs to be appropriately verified in every case.

Secondly, regarding the issue of a host State making an opt-out declaration, it goes without saying that such a State should be party to the Protocol, as referred to in article II, paragraph 3 of the Protocol. Our understanding is that such a declaration can be made at any time prior to the deployment of such operations. We believe that mechanism to be a useful provision that could facilitate the universality of the Protocol.

Last but not least, the different understandings and interpretations of Member States of the term "peacebuilding" in the Protocol must seriously be taking into account.

The President: That concludes the explanations of position following the adoption of the resolution on the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 83?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 108

Measures to eliminate international terrorism

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/60/519)

The President: The General Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 10 of its report.

We shall now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Sixth Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 60/43).

The President: I call on the representative of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, who wishes to speak in explanation of position following the adoption of the resolution.

Ms. Taj El Dine (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Mission of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela joined the consensus on the resolution. However, we would like to make a statement with regard to certain points in that resolution.

Where the fourth preambular paragraph recalls the 2005 World Summit Outcome, we are in fact recalling the result of negotiations that took place behind closed doors and that excluded at least 170 countries. That was the only way possible to reach agreement — in addition, of course, to the imposition of elements and to authoritarianism. Elements such as State terrorism or the difference between the concept of terrorism and the legitimate right of peoples to free self-determination were ignored. That could be accomplished only with the representatives of 16 States in a room — that is, it made it impossible to demonstrate to the international community the genuine differences that exist with regard to this subject. Even worse, we presented to the world's peoples the concept of terrorism from the contemporary Western perspective. A much better example can be found in the failure to reach agreement at the recent Euro-Mediterranean summit. There, the differences within the international community on the subject were obvious.

The term "terrorism" began to be used at the end of the eighteenth century, mainly to refer to violent acts carried out by Governments to ensure the people's submission. Those who practice State terrorism control the system of thought and expression, working in tandem with the media. In general, they use selected incidents of terrorism, exploiting terrorism as much as possible and using it as a pretext for Western violence. The cynicism is astounding, to the point of proclaiming transparent lies, such as that they do not torture, but only use innovative information-gathering methods. Therefore, they have sought to have us abandon the original meaning of the term "terrorism" so that the term will be applied mainly to retail terrorism.

For all those reasons, this delegation has reservations about the resolution's fourth preambular paragraph, because we are referring to a discredited document that, needless to say, is null and void and of no effect for the Republic.

There are other elements that led us to examine the concept of this resolution — for example, the sixth preambular paragraph, which recalls all General Assembly resolutions on this subject. That pleases us, because it includes resolution 39/159 of 1984, which vigorously condemns terrorist policies and practices as a method used by States to deal with other States and peoples. Furthermore, in this resolution, we recall two resolutions that are extremely important for my country: Security Council resolutions 1373 (2001) and 1624 (2005). In that way, the international community is appealing to the United States of America to stop protecting the terrorist Luis Clemente Posada Carriles and to extradite him to Venezuelan territory or, failing that, to prosecute him on its own territory. This resolution also requests that Government to take the measures necessary to prohibit and prevent conduct such as that of its Reverend Pat Robertson, who urges the commission of terrorist acts.

I wish to conclude this statement by expressing our fervent hope that, on 27 February 2006, the Special Committee will meet once again to conclude, by consensus, the elaboration of a comprehensive convention for the elimination of international terrorism. That convention must — and this is very important — respond to the demands of the world's peoples. Let us avoid creating a new legal order that protects the strong and condemns the weak. In other words, let us protect the peoples of the world.

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 108.

Agenda item 116 (*continued*)

Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly

Report of the Sixth Committee (A/60/523)

The President: The Assembly has before it a draft decision recommended by the Sixth Committee in paragraph 5 of its report.

We will now take action on the draft decision, entitled "Adoption by the Sixth Committee of the provisional programme of work for the sixty-first session of the General Assembly". The draft decision was adopted by the Sixth Committee. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft decision was adopted.

The President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 116.

Statement by the President

The President: We have reason to be proud and pleased that the General Assembly has now adopted the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety

of United Nations and Associated Personnel. I know that this outcome was made possible by the constructive and flexible manner in which the Sixth Committee conducted its negotiations. As many others have done, I thank Ambassador Wenaweser for his able leadership in steering the negotiations to a successful conclusion. I should also like to thank the coordinator, Jennifer McIver of New Zealand, for her efforts in that regard.

Today's adoption of the Optional Protocol is an important step in the implementation of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (*resolution 60/1*), as has been pointed out here today. All of those who worked on the Protocol set a good example by the approach and spirit of their work. With a similar search for compromises and creative formulas, we can make rapid progress on other important elements of the world summit follow-up before us.

Our main cause for celebration today is the Optional Protocol itself. Once it has entered into force, it will expand the scope of legal protection to additional categories of United Nations field operations. United Nations and associated personnel continue to face serious threats to their security — including hostage-taking, physical assault and robbery — as they carry out their duties around the world. It is gratifying to note that with the Optional Protocol, that protection will now include United Nations operations conducted for the purpose of delivering humanitarian, political and development assistance in peacebuilding and of delivering emergency humanitarian assistance.

We must condemn those who perpetrate threats and acts of violence against United Nations and associated staff. We remain firm in our resolve to take all necessary action to deal with such threats and to minimize the risks to our staff and associated personnel. That also includes strengthening — as we are now doing — the legal regime of United Nations protection.

I know from my experience in humanitarian field operations how important it is to have this Optional Protocol in place. When I was in Somalia as Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs in 1992, I saw for myself the dangers faced by our staff in their day-to-day work, despite our best efforts to protect them. Some of our colleagues died while trying to provide assistance.

The Optional Protocol will effectively help to protect and boost the morale of those United Nations and associated personnel who risk their lives to serve the vulnerable and needy of the world. The Protocol will also be of great value as the Peacebuilding Commission begins its work.

As a next step, I strongly encourage all Member States to sign and ratify the Optional Protocol when it opens for signature in January next year. I also encourage Member States who have yet to sign and ratify the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel — which is, as the Assembly is aware, the basis for the Optional Protocol — to do so at the earliest opportunity.

Before concluding and giving the floor to the Secretary-General, I would like to take this opportunity to comment on agenda item 108, "Measures to eliminate international terrorism". I am gratified that a resolution on this important and urgent topic was adopted today. We are reminded of the horrors of terrorism so often these days. The resolution serves to remind us of the challenges the international community faces in dealing with the heinous acts of terrorism.

It is crucial for us all to work together to try to end the current impasse in the negotiations of a comprehensive convention on international terrorism, so that we can conclude the convention as soon as possible. The resolution just adopted provides scope for the Ad Hoc Committee to report to the General Assembly upon completion of the comprehensive convention during the current session of the General Assembly, which must remain our goal.

I strongly encourage delegates to use this window of opportunity to continue working, with a sense of urgency, towards a conclusion on the convention. A timely conclusion of work on the convention will send a strong signal of our universal determination to confront the scourge of terrorism. For my part, I will continue to work together with the Chairman of the Sixth Committee on this important matter, as well as on the issue of a counter-terrorism strategy as requested by the 2005 World Summit Outcome. I know that the Secretariat is doing preparatory work on the issue and I intend to report back to you early next year on the counter-terrorism strategy, after consultations with Member States and after contacts with the Secretariat.

I now give the floor to our Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General: I congratulate the General Assembly on the important step it has taken in adopting the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

As I have stressed to you on many occasions, there is no more important responsibility for me as Secretary-General than to ensure the protection of the dedicated men and women who carry out vital missions of development and peace and human rights for the United Nations throughout the world.

Security is also a core obligation of Member States. After all, these are your own nationals. The 1995 Convention is the key legal instrument in efforts to give United Nations and associated personnel the security and the environment they need to do their work. Its entry into force in 1999 was a major step forward in strengthening the legal regime surrounding United Nations protection.

But the Convention had serious flaws: humanitarian, development and other non-peacekeeping operations were covered only through a declaration of exceptional risk. But that requirement was impractical. There are no generally agreed criteria for determining whether such a risk exists. Making such a declaration could be time-consuming. And political considerations could influence what is meant to be a technical assessment. The new Protocol corrects that flaw. It expands the legal protection of all other United Nations operations, from emergency humanitarian assistance to peacebuilding and the delivery of humanitarian, political and development assistance.

At a time when the United Nations continues to face a security environment of unprecedented risk, I thank Member States for supporting our efforts to improve the overall security environment, as well as our security management system under the leadership of the new Department of Safety and Security.

Progress in establishing the new system has been significant. Among the Department's many activities are its efforts to establish close liaison and mutual dialogue between United Nations Designated Officials and host Government security and law enforcement authorities. There is still some way to go in this. I urge Governments to reach out to the United Nations Designated Officials in their countries, so that we can sustain the current momentum.

I also urge Member States that have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Convention — I think the President also made that appeal just moment ago — and all Member States should become party to the Protocol whose adoption we mark today. Without security, our work for the peoples around the world — your people — suffers.

The Assembly has also received today the report of the Sixth Committee on its efforts to conclude a comprehensive convention on international terrorism. Terrorism is one of the grave threats facing humanity in these times. The international community has already made great strides in elaborating many international instruments to combat it. The conclusion of the comprehensive convention would be an important complement to the existing legal framework, and it is therefore important that every effort should be made to finalize negotiations on the text during the current session, as agreed by heads of State and Governments in the 2005 World Summit Outcome document (resolution 60/1).

I encourage all of you to explore all possibilities for reaching a successful outcome early next year, and I stand ready to assist your efforts. I also urge Member States that have not yet done so to become parties to, and to implement, the existing anti-terrorism instruments.

I also stand ready, if so requested by this Assembly, to amplify and further refine the elements of a counter-terrorism strategy that I identified in my Madrid speech last March. As terrorism continues to cause death and suffering to innocent people in many parts of the world, we must do our utmost to forge a comprehensive, coordinated and consistent response.

The President: I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of all of the reports of the Sixth Committee.

Mr. Gaspar Martins (Angola), Vice-President, took the Chair.

Reports of the First Committee

The Acting President: The General Assembly will now consider the reports of the First Committee on agenda items 85 to 105 and 116.

I request the Rapporteur of the First Committee, Ms. Elvina Jusufaj of Albania, to introduce the reports of the First Committee.

Ms. Jusufaj (Albania): It gives me great pleasure to introduce to the General Assembly the reports of the First Committee on agenda items 85 to 105 and 116. Those reports are contained in documents A/60/451 to A/60/471 and A/60/524.

In response to the General Assembly's appeal, the First Committee continued to fully utilize its existing resources and was able to complete its work at the current session in four and a half weeks, holding 23 formal meetings. The work of the Committee at the current session could be characterized as having been substantively constructive, focused and action-oriented.

The First Committee considered 54 draft resolutions and six draft decisions submitted under various disarmament and related international security agenda items. Of the 54 draft resolutions and six draft decisions adopted, 26 draft resolutions and two draft decisions — almost 47 per cent — were adopted without a vote. As at previous sessions, the entire complex of issues relating to weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and the issue of small arms and light weapons, were by far the most important subjects discussed. Of the 60 draft resolutions and decisions adopted, 19 were devoted to nuclear issues.

The disarmament calendar for 2005 has been eventful. This year, in various multilateral forums, Member States have been addressing issues covering the full spectrum of security and disarmament items. In the First Committee, the overwhelming majority of speakers supported the strengthening of existing multilateral agreements — the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Biological Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention — and their universalization.

The majority of speakers, however, expressed disappointment at both the failure of the 2005 NPT Review Conference to agree on a substantive final document, and the omission of a section on disarmament and non-proliferation from the Summit Outcome document. Delegations continued to express concern about the dangers posed by existing stockpiles of weapons in general and of weapons of mass destruction in particular. Many Member States considered that there was an urgent need to reinvigorate the disarmament machinery, especially the Conference on Disarmament and the Disarmament Commission, in order to continue to seek solutions to the current deadlock in the area of multilateral disarmament.

The new action-oriented approach was especially evident in the course of discussions on the entire complex of nuclear weapons. Member States increasingly focused on those aspects of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament that should be addressed on a priority basis in the immediate future. In this context, delegations focused on further efforts necessary to scale down nuclear weapons at both the unilateral and bilateral levels. Those concerns were reflected in a number of draft resolutions, including those on the conclusion of a convention prohibiting the use of nuclear weapons, on reducing nuclear danger, on renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons and on nuclear disarmament.

In the case of a number of draft resolutions, such as those concerning the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East and a nuclear-weapon-free Southern Hemisphere and adjacent area, continued wide support for existing nuclear-weapon-free zones was expressed and calls were made to create new zones as a step leading to a world without nuclear weapons. Member States also expressed their hopes for the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

As far as conventional weapons are concerned, many delegations welcomed progress in the implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons, in particular agreement in the Open-ended Working Group to Negotiate an International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons on the text of an international instrument although a number of Member States expressed regret that the instrument will not be legally binding. The instrument is recommended to the Assembly for adoption in the form of a draft decision.

Before concluding my substantive remarks, allow me to say few words on the issue of the rationalization of the working methods of the First Committee. That issue was considered by the Committee in the context of the overall process of the revitalization of the General Assembly. In follow-up to resolution 59/95 on improving the effectiveness of the methods of work of the First Committee, the Committee successfully implemented an interactive model of its work by hearing presentations on various disarmament and international security issues, including the United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament, the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, and the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters. The Committee also heard presentations by the Director-General of the Organization for the Prohibition of the Chemical Weapons, the Executive Secretary of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, the Chairman of the Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security, the Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the President of the Conference on Disarmament.

The Committee also held an extremely interesting interactive dialogue with the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Nobuyasu Abe, on the follow-up of draft resolutions and decisions adopted by the Committee at its previous session.

For the first time in its history, the First Committee held a direct dialogue in informal session with non-governmental organizations active in the area of disarmament.

Finally, pursuant to the directives of the Assembly under agenda item 116, entitled "Revitalization of the General Assembly", the Committee adopted its proposed programme of work and timetable for its next session, which is recommended for adoption by the Assembly in the form of a draft decision.

Let me now turn briefly to the reports of the First Committee and draw the attention of delegations to some technical errors.

First, the draft resolution under item 97, "General and complete disarmament" entitled "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism", which appears in A/60/463 as draft resolution XIX, was adopted by the Committee by a recorded vote of 162 to none, with no abstentions. That was obviously a technical error. The Assembly may wish to consider the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote.

Secondly, members should note that on page 24 of A/60/463 Cuba is erroneously listed as a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/60/L.40/Rev.1. Cuba did not sponsor that draft resolution.

Before concluding, I should like to pay a well-deserved tribute to all delegations for their active participation in the work of the Committee and their spirit of cooperation in the common search for a better, safer and more stable world.

I should like to express special gratitude to the Chairman of the First Committee, Ambassador Choi Young-jin of the Republic of Korea, who with his intimate knowledge of disarmament and international security matters, as well as his excellent diplomatic skills, led the proceedings of the Committee with vision and able leadership. Let me also, on behalf of the Committee and on my own behalf, extend our sincere gratitude to the Committee's Vice-Chairpersons, Ms. Gabriela Martinic of Argentina, Mr. Detlev Wolter of Germany and Mr. Lotfi Boucharra of Morocco, for their most effective contribution to the work of the Committee.

I should like also to express my appreciation to the Under-Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Nobuyasu Abe, and Mr. Jian Chen, the Under-Secretary-General for General Assembly and Conference Management, for the leadership they provided the Secretariat staff assisting the Committee and for their valuable contribution.

Special thanks go to the Secretary of the First Committee, Ms. Cheryl Stoute, and her staff, Mr. Sergei Cherniavsky, Ms. Christa Giles, Mr. Tam Chung and other Secretariat staff for their valuable assistance to the Committee.

With these brief remarks, I present the reports of the First Committee to the General Assembly for consideration and approval, as contained in documents A/60/451 through A/60/471 and A/60/524.

The Acting President: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the Assembly decides not to discuss the reports of the First Committee which are before it today.

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote, if there are any. The position of delegations regarding the recommendations of the First Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

May I remind members once again that, in accordance with General Assembly decision 34/401, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once — that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee, and that explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendations contained in the reports of the First Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take decisions in the same manner as was done in the Committee, unless notified otherwise in advance. This means that when separate or recorded votes were taken, we will do the same. I hope that we may proceed to adopt without a vote those recommendations that were adopted without a vote in the First Committee.

Agenda item 85

Reduction of military budgets

Report of the First Committee (A/60/451)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution entitled "Objective information on military matters, including transparency of military expenditures". The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 60/44).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 85?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 86

Developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security

Report of the First Committee (A/60/452)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland,

Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 177 votes to 1 (resolution 60/45).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Angola and Mozambique informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 86?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 87

Prohibition of the development and manufacture of new types of weapons of mass destruction and new systems of such weapons: report of the Conference on Disarmament

Report of the First Committee (A/60/453)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Israel.

The draft resolution was adopted by 180 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 60/46).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of item 87?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 88

Question of Antarctica

Report of the First Committee (A/60/454)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 60/47).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 88?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 89

Implementation of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace

Report of the First Committee (A/60/455)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein,

Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey.

The draft resolution was adopted by 132 votes to 3, with 46 abstentions (resolution 60/48).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 89?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 90

African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty

Report of the First Committee (A/60/456)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I consider that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 60/49).

The Acting President: May I take it that the Assembly wishes to conclude its consideration of agenda item 90?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 91

Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)

Report of the First Committee (A/60/457)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 60/50).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 91?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 92

Verification in all its aspects, including the role of the United Nations in the field of verification

Report of the First Committee (A/60/458)

The Acting President: May I take it that the General Assembly wishes to take note of the report of the First Committee contained in document A/60/458?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 92?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 93

Role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament

Report of the First Committee (A/60/459)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia,

Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Paraguay, Russian Federation, Samoa, South Africa, Tajikistan, Tonga, Ukraine, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu.

The draft resolution was adopted by 110 votes to 53, with 17 abstentions (resolution 60/51).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 93?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 94

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East

Report of the First Committee (A/60/460)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The First Committee adopted the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 60/52).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 94?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 95

Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons

Report of the First Committee (A/60/461)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 7 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 120 votes to none, with 59 abstentions (resolution 60/53).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of item 95?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 96

Prevention of an arms race in outer space

Report of the First Committee (A/60/462)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 8 of its report.

We will now take a decision on the draft resolution.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq,

Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

The draft resolution was adopted by 180 votes to 2 (resolution 60/54).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Israel advised the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of item 96?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 97

General and complete disarmament

Report of the First Committee (A/60/463)

The Acting President: The Assembly has before it 29 draft resolutions recommended by the First Committee in paragraph 94 of its report and five draft decisions recommended by the Committee in paragraph 95 of the same report.

Before proceeding further, I should like to inform members that action on draft resolution XXIV, entitled "Transparency in armaments", is postponed to a later date to allow time for the review of its programme budget implications by the Fifth Committee. The Assembly will take action on draft resolution XXIV as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on its programme budget implications is available.

Mr. Ortiz Gandarillas (Bolivia) (*spoke in Spanish*): The proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects has become a global problem and poses a real threat for the very survival of States in all regions of the world. However, a perception of the magnitude of that threat has still not sufficiently penetrated the conscience of the international community, in spite of the fact that all are aware of the devastating effects of a nuclear disaster and the growing potential danger of the acquisition of nuclear weapons by terrorists.

The system for collective security in the twenty-first century requires concrete measures that go beyond national aspirations and goals and that facilitate joint responses to the challenges of today's broader concept of security. Bolivia considers that such a collective security system can be achieved only through full compliance with the provisions of international treaties and other commitments made by States — a demonstration of political will that is equal to our trust in the centrality of multilateralism and that reaffirms the principles and purposes of the Charter.

Mr. Labbé (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution XVIII as a whole. Chile will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution. My country remains unconvinced about the need or usefulness of such a resolution.

Certainly we are suffering from a shortage of resolutions related, directly or indirectly, to nuclear disarmament. Chile co-sponsored resolution XI, entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons". Chile also co-sponsored draft resolution XXII, on the follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice. Chile co-sponsored draft resolution IV, entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas". Chile will vote in favour of draft resolution II, entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free

world" — the draft resolution of the New Agenda Coalition. We will also vote in favour of draft resolution XXVI, originally submitted by India, entitled "Reducing nuclear danger". We have just voted in favour of draft resolution XVI on nuclear disarmament.

Chile has also systematically voted in favour of the resolution entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East", and we remain committed to the important ideas expressed in the fifth, sixth and seventh preambular paragraphs. They reaffirm the resolution on the Middle East adopted on 11 May 1995 by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) — one of the essential components of the political commitment that allow for the indefinite extension of the NPT. Chile believes that that resolution retains its full legitimacy and continues to be of great importance.

If it is true that all of the draft resolutions of the First Committee are political in nature, this one is, too — but in a purely contingent and tactical way that in our opinion does not contribute to nuclear disarmament. Chile also has a special interest in the future of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and thus shares the frustration and irritation of the overwhelming majority of States parties that witnessed the failure of the Seventh Review Conference. We know very well why it failed and who was responsible for the abuse of the consensus rule. In voting, therefore, we will fully bear in mind what occurred last May.

The Acting President: The Assembly will now take a decision on 28 draft resolutions and five draft decisions, one by one. After all the decisions have been taken, representatives will again have the opportunity to explain their votes.

The General Assembly will now turn to paragraph 94 of section III of the report in A/60/463, containing the draft resolutions.

We turn first to draft resolution I, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Barbados, Belarus, Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Russian Federation, South Africa, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

Draft resolution I was adopted by 163 votes to none, with 10 abstentions (resolution 60/55).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution II is entitled "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 4 of draft resolution II. If there is no objection to that request, I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 4, resolution II, on which a separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India, Israel.

Abstaining:

Australia, Bhutan, Cameroon, France, Jamaica, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Operative paragraph 4 was retained by 158 votes to 2, with 11 abstentions.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution II as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Ghana,

Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, India, Israel, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Belarus, Bhutan, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Micronesia (Federated States of), Pakistan, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Slovenia, Spain, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Draft resolution II as a whole was adopted by 153 votes to 5, with 20 abstentions (resolution 60/56).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution III is entitled "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution III without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution III was adopted (resolution 60/57).

The Acting President: Draft resolution IV is entitled "Nuclear-weapon-free southern hemisphere and adjacent areas".

Separate votes have been requested on the last three words, "and South Asia", of operative paragraph 5 and on operative paragraph 5 as a whole. If there is no objection to those requests, I shall first put to the vote the words "and South Asia", on which a separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi

Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India, Pakistan.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Marshall Islands, Myanmar, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

The words "and South Asia" were retained by 162 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Israel informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote operative paragraph 5 as a whole, on which a separate, recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, France, Israel, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Operative paragraph 5 as a whole was retained by 162 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution IV as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria,

Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, India, Israel, Marshall Islands, Pakistan, Palau, Russian Federation, Spain.

Draft resolution IV as a whole was adopted by 167 votes to 3, with 8 abstentions (resolution 60/58).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution V is entitled "Promotion of multilateralism in the area of disarmament and non-proliferation".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, France, Israel, Latvia, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Vanuatu.

Draft resolution V was adopted by 122 votes to 8, with 50 abstentions (resolution 60/59).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour; the delegations of France and Tonga had intended to abstain.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution VI is entitled "Observance of environmental norms in the drafting and implementation of agreements on disarmament and arms control".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

France, Israel, Palau, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Draft resolution VI was adopted by 176 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions (resolution 60/60).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution VII is entitled "Relationship between disarmament and development".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia,

Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

France, Israel.

Draft resolution VII was adopted by 177 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions (resolution 60/61).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution VIII is entitled "The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname,

Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Iran (Islamic Republic of).

Abstaining:

Algeria, Cuba, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Lebanon, Malaysia, Mauritius, Mexico, Pakistan, Syrian Arab Republic.

Draft resolution VIII was adopted by 158 votes to 1, with 11 abstentions (resolution 60/62).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Angola and Iraq informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution IX is entitled "Regional disarmament".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution IX without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution IX was adopted (resolution 60/63).

The Acting President: Draft resolution X is entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution X without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution X was adopted (resolution 60/64).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XI is entitled "Renewed determination towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Bhutan, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Israel, Myanmar, Pakistan.

Draft resolution XI was adopted by 168 votes to 2, with 7 abstentions (resolution 60/65).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Angola, Benin, Kiribati and the Russian Federation informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution XII is entitled "Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space activities". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Israel.

Draft resolution XII was adopted by 178 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 60/66).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution XIII is entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution XIII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XIII was adopted (resolution 60/67).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XIV is entitled "Addressing the negative humanitarian and development impact of the illicit manufacture, transfer and circulation of small arms and light weapons and their excessive accumulation".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Draft resolution XIV was adopted by 177 votes to 1 (resolution 60/68).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution XV is entitled "National legislation on transfer of arms, military equipment and dual-use goods and technology".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution XV without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XV was adopted (resolution 60/69).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XVI is entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian

Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, India, Ireland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malta, Mauritius, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Sweden, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.

Draft resolution XVI was adopted by 113 votes to 45, with 20 abstentions (resolution 60/70).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Angola and Indonesia informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution XVII is entitled "Assistance to States for curbing the illicit traffic in small arms and light weapons and collecting them".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution XVII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XVII was adopted (resolution 60/71).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XVIII is entitled "Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons".

A separate vote has been requested on the sixth preambular paragraph of draft resolution XVIII. If there is no objection to that request, I shall first put that paragraph to the vote.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Fiji, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Burundi, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte

d'Ivoire, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, Liberia, Malawi, Mauritius, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Uruguay.

The sixth preambular paragraph was retained by 78 votes to 56, with 27 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Uruguay informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution XVIII as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Eritrea, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Belarus, Bolivia, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Honduras, India, Liberia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Niger, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru.

Draft resolution XVIII as a whole was adopted by 87 votes to 56, with 26 abstentions (resolution 60/72).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Uruguay informed the Secretariat that it had intended to abstain.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution XIX is entitled "Preventing the risk of radiological terrorism". Recalling the statement made by the Rapporteur concerning this draft resolution earlier in the meeting, may I take it that the Assembly wishes to adopt draft resolution XIX without a vote?

Draft resolution XIX was adopted (resolution 60/73).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XX is entitled "Problems arising from the accumulation of conventional ammunition stockpiles in surplus".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution XX without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XX was adopted (resolution 60/74).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXI is entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

India.

Abstaining:

Bhutan.

Draft resolution XXI was adopted by 174 votes to 1, with 1 abstention (resolution 60/75).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXII is entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*".

A separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution XXII. Are there any objections to this request? I see none.

I shall first put to the vote operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution XXII.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua,

Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, Russian Federation, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Belarus, France, Latvia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution XXII was retained by 165 votes to 3, with 4 abstentions.

The Acting President: I shall now put to the vote draft resolution XXII as a whole.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Montenegro, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uzbekistan.

Draft resolution XXII as a whole was adopted by 126 votes to 29, with 24 abstentions (resolution 60/76).

[Subsequently, the delegations of Angola and Benin informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour, and the delegation of Germany had intended to vote against.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXIII is entitled "Prevention of the illicit transfer and unauthorized access to and use of man-portable air defence systems".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution XXIII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XIII was adopted (resolution 60/77).

The Acting President: Members will recall that, as announced earlier in the meeting, action on draft resolution XXIV will be taken as soon as the report of the Fifth Committee on its programme budget implications is available.

Draft resolution XXV is entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution XXV without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XXV was adopted (resolution 60/78).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXVI is entitled "Reducing nuclear danger".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Poland, Portugal, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, China, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Paraguay, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Ukraine, Uzbekistan.

Draft resolution XXVI was adopted by 115 votes to 49, with 15 abstentions (resolution 60/79).

[Subsequently, the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXVII is entitled "Implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina,

Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Liberia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Cuba, Egypt, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Myanmar, Pakistan, Palau, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Syrian Arab Republic, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam.

Draft resolution XXVII was adopted by 158 votes to none, with 17 abstentions (resolution 60/80).

[Subsequently the delegations of Angola and Mongolia informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXVIII is entitled "The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects".

In the Committee, operative paragraph 2 of the draft resolution XXVIII was adopted by a vote. However, the Secretariat has been notified that there is no request for a separate vote on operative paragraph 2. We shall therefore proceed to take action on draft resolution XXVIII.

The First Committee adopted draft resolution XXVIII without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft resolution XXVIII was adopted (resolution 60/81).

The Acting President: Draft resolution XXIX is entitled "Information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional arms".

The First Committee adopted draft resolution XXIX without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft resolution XXIX was adopted (resolution 60/82).

The Acting President: Will delegations now please turn to paragraph 95 of Section III, concerning the draft decisions.

Draft decision I is entitled "Missiles". A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic

Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Vanuatu.

Draft decision I was adopted by 120 votes to 2, with 53 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegations of Angola and Niger informed the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft decision II is entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Central Asia".

The First Committee adopted draft decision II without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do likewise?

Draft decision II was adopted.

The Acting President: Draft decision III is entitled "United Nations conference to identify ways of eliminating nuclear dangers in the context of disarmament".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

France, Israel, Poland, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Palau, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey.

Draft decision III was adopted by 128 votes to 5, with 40 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: Draft decision IV is entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament".

The First Committee adopted draft decision IV without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

Draft decision IV was adopted.

The Acting President: Draft decision V is entitled "International instrument to enable States to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons".

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, San Marino, Sao Tome and Principe, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

None.

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

Draft decision V was adopted by 151 votes to none, with 25 abstentions.

[Subsequently the delegation of Angola informed the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Acting President: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Rodríguez Zahar (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*). Our explanation of vote relates to the resolution on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects.

During the voting, Mexico joined in the adoption of the resolution on the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons because we believed that our points of view had been sufficiently expressed during the voting conducted in the context of the work of the First Committee. Consistent with what was stated on that occasion, and with a view to the next review conference, my delegation wishes to reiterate its concern that the agreements reached thus far continue to be diluted and that instruments are being adopted on the basis of the lowest common denominator.

Mr. Song Se Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): This morning, on the basis of its principled stand in favour of nuclear disarmament, particularly the total elimination of nuclear weapons, the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea voted in favour of draft resolution XVIII under agenda item 97, as contained in document A/60/463, entitled "Follow-up to nuclear disarmament obligations agreed to at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons". The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is of the view that nuclear disarmament is the essence of disarmament and that disarmament efforts should be oriented towards the complete dismantlement of nuclear weapons. It is nuclear weapons that pose the most serious risk to the world's peace and security.

The various review conferences of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and this year's High-level Plenary Meeting underscore the urgency of nuclear disarmament. In that context, my delegation is concerned that the United States and its allies are insisting on non-proliferation while setting aside the issue of nuclear disarmament, which is tantamount to a declaration in favour of the permanent existence and possession of nuclear weapons. Such arguments and logic, instead of preventing proliferation, will only push non-nuclear-weapon States towards the acquisition of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear disarmament is the best way to achieve non-proliferation. There cannot be non-proliferation without nuclear disarmament. It is therefore essential first to remove the root cause of proliferation if we are serious about non-proliferation. The concerns of certain States about proliferation will be automatically dispelled if nuclear weapon arsenals are completely dismantled.

Today, non-nuclear-weapon States are under constant nuclear threat because of the continued development of new types of nuclear weapons and nuclear threats by the super-Power with the largest nuclear weapon stockpiles. Now is the opportune moment for all nuclear-weapon States to take effective disarmament measures towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons. A legally binding international instrument on negative security assurances should be concluded with a view to removing the danger of the potential use of nuclear weapons, which is the main concern of non-nuclear-weapon States.

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is committed to do all it can to create a world that is free of nuclear weapons forever.

Mr. Gala López (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): With respect to draft resolution I, entitled "Compliance with non-proliferation, arms limitation and disarmament agreements", contained in the report of the First Committee (*A/60/463*), my delegation abstained for the following reasons.

In October 2002, Cuba, together with various other delegations in the First Committee, was concerned about some of the amendments made to the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/57/L.54, which was later adopted as resolution 57/86. On that occasion, my delegation said that the draft resolution constituted a step backwards with respect to resolution 52/30, which was previously adopted by the General Assembly.

Today, the delegation of Cuba wishes to express its dissatisfaction with respect to the text of the corresponding draft resolution, which has just been adopted by a recorded vote. Not only did the new resolution omit several positive elements in resolution 57/86, but controversial wording was inserted, further removing the new text from the letter and the spirit of resolution 52/30. There are no convincing arguments to explain the drastic and regrettable changes to the text of this year's resolution, whose final version continues to have clear deficiencies, including the following.

First, in general, a selective, unbalanced and politicized approach can be noted in the resolution adopted. Secondly, in the resolution's title, as well as in some of its paragraphs, the order of the terms "arms limitation", "disarmament" and "non-proliferation" has been changed, with the clear intention of highlighting the term "non-proliferation".

Further, the number of references to the States parties was reduced. Previously agreed language was not restored to the text. That language had made reference to the concept of resolving compliance issues through means compatible with existing agreements and with international law. The role played by the mechanisms and procedures provided for in international agreements was omitted from the resolution's treatment of the question of verification. Finally, the resolution's operative section contains controversial and ambiguous language open to arbitrary manipulation.

Cuba has always defended the need to preserve and strengthen multilateralism and ensure strict respect for disarmament, non-proliferation and arms limitation agreements. At the same time, we are convinced that States parties, without double standards, must comply with all their respective obligations stemming from all articles of those agreements.

It should be noted that the principal author of the aforementioned text still has in its power a great stockpile of nuclear weapons, despite the fact that it has clear obligations with respect to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, including vertical proliferation, as established by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

We emphasize the urgency of full compliance with the provisions of article VI of the NPT. We also emphasize the importance for international agreements to be accompanied by verification mechanisms to promote cooperation among the parties, resolve their disputes, facilitate compliance with obligations and discourage unilateral measures that contravene the principles of international law and the United Nations Charter.

Finally, I would like to reaffirm the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. And we reaffirm that the most effective and most sustainable way to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention is precisely through multilateral negotiations to conclude a legally binding international instrument that includes international verification measures, to which, as is well known, the principal author of the draft resolution is opposed.

Mr. Ben-Shaban (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of my country abstained in the vote on resolution XXVII, on implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction, because my country is not a party to the Convention. Despite that Convention's positive qualities, it does not respond to the concerns of my country and other countries.

First, the Convention does not address the security issues of small countries, which have very limited capacities and cannot protect themselves other than through recourse to anti-personnel mines.

Secondly, the Convention does not adequately deal with the issue of anti-personnel mine debris left behind by certain countries that participated in the Second World War and by other countries. We do not talk about the responsibilities of those countries, which have to help smaller countries dispose of mine debris. Millions of anti-personnel mines remain in our countries. They constitute an obstruction to agriculture and development and have caused numerous casualties.

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of item 97.

Before adjourning this meeting, I would like to inform members that, in view of the late hour, the General Assembly will take up the remaining reports of the First Committee and the reports of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee — the Fourth Committee — at 3 p.m. today.

Organization of work

The Acting President: Member States will recall, that at its 17th plenary meeting, on 20 September 2005, the General Assembly approved the recommendation of the General Committee that the Second Committee would complete its work by Tuesday, 6 December 2005 and that the Fifth Committee would complete its work by Friday, 9 December 2005. However, I have been informed by the Chairs of both Committees that they will not be able to finish their work by those dates. Therefore, the

General Assembly would need to extend the work of the Second and the Fifth Committee.

In order to accommodate those requests, may I take it that the General Assembly agrees to extend the work of the Second Committee until Friday, 9 December 2005, and of the Fifth Committee until Thursday, 22 December 2005?

If there is no objection, may I take it that the Assembly agrees to this proposal?

It was so decided.

Postponement of the date of recess

The Acting President: In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of members to the date of recess of the current session. This is also of relevance to all of you. Members will recall that at its 17th plenary meeting, on 20 September 2005, the General Assembly decided that the sixtieth session would recess on Tuesday, 13 December 2005. However, in view of the work that remains to be done for this part of the session and the decision just taken, I would like to propose to the Assembly that it postpone the date of recess of the current session to Thursday, 22 December.

If there is no objection, may I take it that the Assembly agrees to this proposal?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.25 p.m.